



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/563,894

06/01/2006

Katri Keski-Nisula

LMI001.820714

7027

21831

7590

04/23/2009

WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLP
250 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10177

EXAMINER

PATEL, YOGESH P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3732

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/23/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO@WOLFBLOCK.COM
ggress@wolfblock.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/563,894	Applicant(s) KESKI-NISULA ET AL.	
	Examiner YOGESH PATEL	Art Unit 3732	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) YOGESH PATEL. (3) AUDE, GERSPACHER.

(2) RALPH, LEWIS. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 20 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: CATHCART ET AL. (2,966,908).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ref. by Cathcart was discussed. Applicant argued that Cathcart comprises an inner wall (e.g. wall 7) which is not present in Applicant's invention. To overcome Cathcart, the Examiner suggested incorporating language such as "the device consist of." No agreement was made during the interview. .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/YOGESH PATEL/ Examiner, Art Unit 3732	/Ralph Lewis/ Primary Examiner, AU 3732
---	--